

REMARKS

As of this response claims 1-42 are pending in this application and are subject to a restriction requirement. In particular, the claims are alleged to recite two distinct inventions, i.e., Groups I and II. As a result of the restriction/species election, claims 1-23, 28, 29 and 39-42 remain pending in the application. Claims 24-27 and 30-38 are withdrawn from consideration, without prejudice to refiling these claims.

I. PROVISIONAL ELECTION REQUIRED UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.143

An election of inventions is required in this response. Accordingly, applicant elects, with traverse, the claims of Group I, claims 1-30 and 39-40, and requests that the remaining claims 31-38, be withdrawn without prejudice.

An election of species is required in this response. Accordingly, applicant elects, with traverse, the species of claims 1-23, 28, 29 and 39-40. Subject to the applicant's election with traverse, claims 24-27 and 30 are withdrawn from consideration.

II. TRAVERSE OF RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement with respect to claims 1-42. Pursuant to MPEP §803, a restriction requirement is proper only if: (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed, and (2) there would be a serious burden on the examiner if the restriction is not required. Without addressing the issue of whether the claimed mems transducer and method of making a mems transducer are patentably distinct from each other, the applicant respectfully submits that a search and examination of the complete set of claims would not impose a serious burden on the examiner. The applicant submits that examination of a set of claims

directed to the both the structure of the mems transducer and the method of making the same would not place a serious burden upon the examiner if restriction is not required.

MPEP §802.01 states that the distinctness required for restriction means that the subjects "ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER" (emphasis with capital letters in original). (See also MPEP §808.02, which states that where "related inventions are not patentably distinct as claimed, restriction ... is never proper." The Patent Office has also stated that "it is imperative the requirement should never be made where related inventions as claimed are not distinct." MPEP §806.)

These positions are necessary to entry of the restriction requirement by the Office and may be relied upon by the applicant during examination of this and continuing applications, unless the restriction requirement is withdrawn. If the examiner is not taking these positions, then it is submitted that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn upon reconsideration.

III. TRAVERSE OF ELECTION REQUIREMENT

The examiner alleges the claims of Group I recite three separate species: A1. A transducer unit mounted on a board; A2. A housing covering a transducer unit and A3. A cover placed over a substrate with a recess. While all of the pending claims of Group I recite structure that may correspond to a housing for shielding and/or protecting a transducer, as noted below, the applicant elects the claims of Species A2. By election of the Species A2, the applicant elects the following claims of Group I, claims 1-23, 28, 29 and 39-42.

For example, claim 1 recites, among other things, a printed circuit board and a cover defining a portion of a housing and a transducer unit mounted within the housing. Claim 2-18, and 39-42 recite additional characteristics of the housing and/or the structure defining the housing. Claim 19 recites, among other things, a housing that covers a transducer unit. Claim 20-23 recite additional characteristics of the housing and/or the structure defining the housing. Claim 28 recites, among other things, a printed circuit board and a cover defining a housing for protecting and/or shielding a transducer unit. Claim 28 recites, among other things, a printed circuit board and a cover defining a housing for protecting and/or shielding a transducer unit.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-27 and 30, withdrawn as a result of this election, and allegedly of a separate species as identified by the examiner, species A3, are also appropriately included in the elected species and should be examined. That these claims recite specific structure without reciting a housing *per se*, does not create any additional burden on the examiner with respect to search and/or examination of the application. For example, each of these claims recites, among other things, a substrate and a cover, wherein the cover and substrate cooperate for shielding and/or protecting the transducer. It is clear the examiner is required in connection with the examination of claims 1-23, 28, 29 and 39-42 that recite a housing, wherein the housing may consist of a cover and a substrate, is inherently searching the invention of claims 24-27 and 30.

The applicant sees in the application no pending or withdrawn claims to the alleged species A1, a transducer unit mounted to a board apart from any other structure.

IV. CONCLUSION

For these foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully requests an action on the merits of all the claims and a Notice of Allowance thereof. If there are any additional fees or refunds required, the Commissioner is directed to charge or debit Deposit Account No. 13-2855 (30521/491A). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted for,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

August 25, 2005

By: 

Anthony G. Sitko
Reg. No. 36,278
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402
(312) 474-6300